

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/755,047	01/08/2001	Takuji Goda	K-1951	6751
7	590 06/18/2002			
KANESAKA AND TAKEUCHI 1423 Powhatan Street Alexandria, VA 22314			EXAMINER PIZIALI, ANDREW T	
			1775	(
			DATE MAILED: 06/18/2002)

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,			MA	5
		Application No.	pplicant(s)	
٠		09/755,047	GODA ET AL.	
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Andrew T Piziali	1775	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on th cov r sheet v	vith the correspondenc address	
THE M - Extens after S - if the p - if NO p - Failure - Any re	PRIENT STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION Sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Deriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per et or reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state ply received by the Office later than three months after the maximum statutory. It is patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thicd will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO tute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. IBANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on (08 January 2001 .		
2a)□	<u> </u>	This action is non-final.		
3)□	Since this application is in condition for alle closed in accordance with the practice und			
·	on of Claims	on.		
•	Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application			
	(a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	arawn from consideration.		
·	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
	Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected.			
·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.	W. J. C. Santana		
Application	Claim(s) are subject to restriction an on Papers			
•	he specification is objected to by the Exam			
10)∐ T	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ a			
4 A) 🗆 🖚	Applicant may not request that any objection to			
11)[1	he proposed drawing correction filed on		disapproved by the Examiner.	
40) 🗆 🖪	If approved, corrected drawings are required in			
•	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	CX8IIIIIEI.		
	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		0.440(-) (4) - (5)	
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	eign priority under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(a)-(d) or (t).	
,-	☑ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:			
	1. Certified copies of the priority docum			
	2. Certified copies of the priority docum			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International ee the attached detailed Office action for a	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))		
14)∐ A	cknowledgment is made of a claim for dom	estic priority under 35 U.S.C	C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application	1).
	☐ The translation of the foreign language cknowledgment is made of a claim for dom	•		
Attachment	(s)			
2) D Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(/ 5) Notice of	v Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/755,047

Art Unit: 1775

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The Information Disclosure Statements, filed 4/5/2001 and 3/14/2002, have been considered. Two of the documents cited in the IDS submitted on 4/5/2001 are found on the IDS submitted on 3/14/2002. The examiner has crossed out the second citing of these references to avoid confusion. Two initialed PTO-1449 forms are enclosed with this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The applicant claims that an electrode film is formed on the insulating film, but does enable one skilled in the art to use the electrode film. The specification only teaches that an electrode film, if necessary, may be formed on the insulating film (page 6, lines 13-15). It is not clear why the electrode film may necessarily be present, or what function the electrode film performs.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:
 - A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
 - (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 09/755,047

Art Unit: 1775

5. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,808,715 to Tsai et al.

Regarding claims 1-5, Tsai discloses a liquid crystal display glass article comprising an alkali-containing glass substrate, a TiO₂-SiO₂ composite under layer, an ITO layer, and a TiO₂-SiO₂ insulating film in that enumerated order (column 4, lines 15-32).

Regarding claims 4-5, Tsai does not mention the surface electrical resistance of the insulating film, but considering that the insulating film comprises a highly resistant composite of TiO_2 -SiO₂ (column 4, lines 15-32 and column 6, lines 16-18), and since the material is substantially identical to the material suggested by the applicant (see applicants' specification on page 11, lines 10-13), the film would inherently possess an electrical resistance within the range of 1.0×10^6 to $1.0 \times 10^{16} \Omega$ / even after a heating process at 550C for 1 hour.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,808,715 to Tsai et al. and in view of US Patent No. 6,034,474 to Ueoka et al.

Tsai does not mention forming an electrode film on the liquid crystal display glass article, but Ueoka discloses that it is known in the art of liquid crystal/plasma displays to deposit a silver layer on the surface of a glass article comprising a glass substrate and ITO layer, to form an electrode bus that enables the electrode to have a lowered electrical resistance (column 1, lines

Application/Control Number: 09/755,047

Art Unit: 1775

31-47). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to deposit a silver layer on the glass article of Tsai, because the silver layers form an electrode bus that enables the electrode to have a lower electrical resistance.

8. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,808,715 to Tsai et al. and in view of US Patent No. 5,548,186 to Ota.

Tsai does not mention forming an electrode film on the liquid crystal display glass article, but Ota discloses that it is known in the art of liquid crystal/plasma displays to deposit a silver layer on the surface of a glass article comprising a glass substrate and transparent conductive film such as tin oxide, to form an electrode bus that lowers the electrical resistance of the article (column 1, lines 12-26 and column 3, lines 1-6). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to deposit a silver layer on the glass article of Tsai, because the silver layers form an electrode bus that lowers electrical resistance of the glass article.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Piziali whose telephone number is (703) 306-0145 and whose fax number is (703) 746-7037. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached at (703) 308-3822. The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 1775

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-5665.

atp

June 6, 2002

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER